



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*MoS*

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/199,655      | 11/25/98    | MATHIES              | R 71180-024827      |

IM22/1129  
PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO  
725 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET SUITE 1200  
LOS ANGELES CA 90017-5443

EXAMINER

BEX, P

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1743

DATE MAILED: 11/29/00

*9*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/199,655

Applicant(s)  
Mathies et al.

Examiner  
Patricia Kathryn Bex

Group Art Unit  
1743



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Patricia Kathryn Bex

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Andrew Grossman

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 28, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14

Identification of prior art discussed:

Wilson WO 97/34138

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Grossman suggested incorporating the limitations of claim 14 into claim 1 in order to overcome the U.S.C 103(a) rejection of claims 1-13 and 31-35 under Wilson (WO 97/341138) set forth in the previous Office Action. Applicant also agreed to clarify the language contained in claim 14. Examiner agreed to consider the amendment when submitted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

PATRICIA KATHRYN BEX  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1743

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.